

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated October 4, 2010 has been received and its contents have been carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph as allegedly passing the 3-prong test.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-13 are currently pending for reconsideration. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 10 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Sixth Paragraph

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph as allegedly passing the 3-prong test.

While Applicant does not agree with the rejections, Applicant accepts the claim interpretations recited in the Office Action and does not believe further amendments to the

claims are necessary. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 2, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al.*, *Ito et al.*, *St. Pierre.*, and *Anderson et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least the newly cited feature that the decoding means is configured to decode the still image file including the still image data to output the decoded still image file to the video signal output means, and wherein the decoding means does not decode the still image file during the second determination means analyzing the header of the still image file to determine whether or not the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format.

Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, “the decoding unit does not decode the image data read by the reading unit during the second determination unit analyzing the header of the still image file to determine whether or not the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format” and independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, “the decoding means does not decode the still image file during the second determination means analyzing the header of the still image file to determine whether or not the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format.” Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al.*, *Ito et al.*, *St.*

Pierre., and *Anderson et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose at least these claimed combinations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, as amended, are patentable over the applied art.

Furthermore, claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-13 depend from allowable independent claims 2, 6, and 10, respectively. Applicant respectfully asserts that these dependent claims also are allowable at least because of the additional features they recite and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: /Haining Shu/
Haining Shu
Reg. No. L0622

Dated: January 4, 2011

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001